

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Butte)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SATNAM SADU KOSTENDENOUS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C063883

(Super. Ct. No.
CM031516)

This is an appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*).

Defendant Satnam Sadu Kostendenous pleaded no contest to possession of concentrated cannabis, and the trial court granted him Proposition 36 probation, and reinstated him on probation in a trailing misdemeanor case. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11357, subd. (a).) He was given no time credits on this case, because the time was credited to his misdemeanor case, in an amount that was to be determined later.

The factual basis for the plea shows that on the date stated in the complaint--October 13, 2009--defendant possessed

concentrated cannabis. He claimed to be a medical marijuana user, but he was unable to document this fact and lied about where he obtained the contraband.

Defendant timely filed this appeal, and obtained a certificate of probable cause based on his claim that his attorney ignored evidence showing defendant was a legitimate medical marijuana user.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed a brief setting forth the facts of the case and requesting this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (See *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having examined the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

We concur: _____ HULL _____, Acting P. J.

_____ ROBIE _____, J.

_____ BUTZ _____, J.